



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CHING-MING CHANG
P.O. BOX 55-846
TAIPEI 104
TAIWAN

COPY MAILED

MAY 27 2005

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of	:	
Ching-Ming Chang	:	
Application No. 10/033,472	:	ON PETITION
Filed: December 24, 2001	:	
Attorney Docket No. N/A	:	

This is a decision on the renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(a), filed May 9, 2005, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **dismissed**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a)."

This application became abandoned for failure to timely file a proper reply to the final Office action mailed April 20, 2004. A three (3) month extension of time having been obtained pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a), the date of abandonment of this application is October 21, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on December 10, 2004.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;

(2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(1);

(3) A showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable; and

(4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section.

This petition lacks items (1) and (3) above.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account." Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable." Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Regarding Item (1):

A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final action must include a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 or cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each claim so rejected. Accordingly, in a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to timely file a proper reply to a final action, the reply required for consideration of a petition to revive must be one of the following:

- (A) a Notice of Appeal and appeal fee;
- (B) an amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 that cancels all the rejected claims or otherwise prima facie places the application in condition for allowance;
- (C) the filing of an RCE (accompanied by a submission that meets the reply requirements of 37 CFR 1.111 and the requisite fee) under 37 CFR 1.114 for utility or plant applications filed on or after June 8, 1995 (see paragraph (d) below); or
- (D) the filing of a continuing application under 37 CFR 1.53(b). See MPEP 711.03(c).

As the required reply has not been submitted, the petition must be dismissed.

Regarding item (3):

Petitioner states, in part:

2. This is the same "examination result" as shown in the advisory action (P. 2; 12/8/04), saying that: "The amendment of 10/20/2004 fails to place the application in condition for allowance and... , the application will be abandoned. The amendment was merely a duplicate of a previously filed amendment." No, absolutely no, my Response/amendment filed on 10/20/2004 was not a duplicate of previously filed amendment.

...

4. It was thought that there might be a misleading or negligence by the Examiner since the Examiner seems not to

examine the Merits of this application especially in view of the Response/amendment of 10/20/2004.

It appears that petitioner has issues regarding the Office actions issued by the Patent Examiner. Please note, the Office of Petitions is not the appropriate forum in which to resolve such issues. See MPEP 1002.02(c).

The official record of the above-identified application indicates that petitioner timely submitted a response to the final Office action, with a three (3) month extension of time, on October 20, 2004. However, as noted in the Advisory Action, mailed December 8, 2004, the response, an amendment, did NOT place the application in condition for allowance. As such, the application became abandoned on October 21, 2004 when the extended statutory period for response expired.

Accordingly, petitioner has not provided a showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable.

Please note, petitioner may not rely upon non-receipt of an advisory action to establish that the delay was unavoidable. 37 CFR 1.116 and 1.135(b) are manifest that proceedings concerning an amendment after final rejection will not operate to avoid abandonment of the application in the absence of a timely and proper appeal. A delay is not "unavoidable" when an applicant simply permits the maximum extendable statutory period for reply to a final Office action to expire while awaiting a notice of allowance or other action. See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(c)(2).

Furthermore, a delay resulting from the lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP does not constitute an "unavoidable" delay. See Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1132 (N.D. Ind. 1987), Vincent v. Mossinghoff, 230 USPQ 621, 624 (D.D.C. 1985); Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 130, 131 (1891). A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to: (1) the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from Office employees; or (2) the Office's failure to advise the applicant of any deficiency in sufficient time to permit the applicant to take

corrective action. See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985); see also In re Colombo, Inc., 33 USPQ2d 1530, 1532 (Comm'r Pat. 1994) (while the Office attempts to notify applicants of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction, the Office has no obligation to notify parties of deficiencies in their responses in a manner permitting a timely correction).

Petitioner may wish to consider filing a renewed petition under amended 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b). 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) now provides that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b). A grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(m), currently \$750.00 for a small entity;
- (3) A **statement** that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(c).

Please note, this decision is not a final Agency action.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail: Mail Stop Petition
 Commissioner for Patents
 Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313

By FAX: (703) 872-9306
Attn: Office of Petitions

By hand: Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at
(571) 272-3228.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'EJ Tannouse', followed by a long horizontal line.

Edward J. Tannouse
Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions/Patent
United States Patent and Trademark Office